



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,159	01/15/2004	Randy E. Luth	P06479US0	4834

22885 7590 09/16/2004

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, STEPHEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3641

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,159

Applicant(s)

LUTH, RANDY E.

ST

Examiner

Stephen M. Johnson

Art Unit

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/15/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3641

1. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 3; and in claim 6, line 1; what the term “its” is intended to represent is indefinite. In claim 1, line 5; in claim 2, line 3; and in claim 8, line 2; how is the term “a gun barrel” intended to relate to the previously claimed ‘a gun barrel’ (see claim 1, line 2)?

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the gas tube (see claim 7) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3641

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has not described in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill to make and use the same what non-metallic material is intended to have a melting point of at least 590 degrees F. Nor has applicant described what additives would provide the function of increasing heat stabilization, heat aging resistance, and lubrication.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant has not included what non-metallic material is intended to have a melting point of at least 590 degrees F. Nor has applicant described what additive or additives would provide an increased heat stabilization, heat aging resistance, and/or lubrication.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 3641

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Faifer (321 B2).

Faifer (321 B2) discloses a handguard assembly comprising:

- a) a pair of half sections; 12, 14
- b) spaced radial fins; and see fig. 5 (inside 14)
- c) a non-metallic composition. col. 2, line 22

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kennedy (676).

Kennedy (676) discloses a handguard assembly comprising:

- a) a pair of half sections; 32, 34
- b) spaced radial fins; and 46
- c) a non-metallic composition. col. 3, lines 36-39

10. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reamue (876).

Reamue (876) discloses a handguard assembly comprising:

- a) a pair of half sections; 152, 154
- b) spaced radial fins; and see fig. 3, portion adjacent 166, 168

Art Unit: 3641

c) a non-metallic composition.

col. 6, lines 34-37

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reaume (876) in view of Howard et al. (372 B1).

Reaume (876) applies as recited above. However, undisclosed is a thermoplastic material that is a glass fiber reinforced polyamide. Howard et al. (372 B1) teach a thermoplastic material that is a glass fiber reinforced polyamide (col. 3, lines 44-52). Applicant is substituting one plastic material for another in an analogous art setting. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Howard et al. (372 B1) to the Reaume (876) handguard and have a handguard composed of a different type of plastic material.

13. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schvyder et al..

Schnyder et al. disclose a handguard assembly comprising:

a) a pair of half sections;

col. 5, lines 55-59

b) spaced radial fins with intervening gap; and

22

c) a non-metallic composition.

col. 2, lines 26-30

14. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schvyder et al. in view of Olson (363).

Art Unit: 3641

Schvyder et al. apply as previously recited. However, undisclosed is a fin portion having a free end that is concave in shape bordered by straight edges. Olson (363) teaches a fin portion having a free end that is concave in shape bordered by straight edges, see figs. 9, 10. Applicant is substituting one fin portion for another in an analogous art setting. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Olson (363) to the Schvyder et al. handguard and have a handguard with a different type of fin portion.

15. Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Neal.

Neal discloses a handguard assembly comprising:

- a) a pair of half sections; 14, 16
 - b) spaced radial fins with intervening gap; 50
 - c) a non-metallic composition ; and col. 3, lines 20-26;
col. 4, lines 31-33
 - d) a fin portion having concave shaped inner free end edges 50 (see fig. 2)
- and straight edges with an intervening longitudinal channel.

16. Claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kurak discloses a state of the art handguard.


18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Johnson whose telephone number is 703-306-4158.

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the

Art Unit: 3641

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4177.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9326. The fax phone number for after final communications is (703) 872-9327.



STEPHEN M. JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Stephen M. Johnson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3641

SMJ